



STW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 09/806,368
Applicant : Mieko KATSUURA et al
Filed : September 20, 2001
TC/A.U. : 1647
Examiner : Rachel B. Kapust

Docket No. : 2923-0581
Customer No. : 6449
Confirmation No. : 8538
Title : BONE MORPHOGENETIC PROTEIN ANTAGONIST BASED ON THE
MATURE PROTEIN

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

October 19, 2004

Sir:

In further response to the Office Action of June 15, 2004, applicants wish to point out the following clerical errors which were made in the September 14, 2004 response.

Pages 9-11 of the response refer to "BMPR-11", "type 11" and "BMPR-1". These terms should have been "BMPR-II", "type II" and "BMPR-I" respectively.

Page 10 of the response references "(Bone, vol. 19, 199fi)", which should have been "(Bone, Vol. 19, 1996)".

Page 11 of the response states that "It is assumed that these hydrophobic amino acids play an important role for genetic activity", this statement should have indicated that the hydrophobic amino acids play an important role in *bone morphogenetic* activity.

Page 11, line 15, of the response states that the “amino acids Trp 28/Trp 31 and Trp 28/Val 67 of the two monomers of a dimeric BMP-2 are very close together and presumably form a hydrophobic pocket which binds to BMPR-1”. This statement should have indicated that the “amino acids Trp 28/Trp 31 and Val 67 of the two monomers of a dimeric BMP-2 are very close together and presumably form a hydrophobic pocket which binds to BMPR-1”.

Page 11, line 17, of the response states that the “other BMP proteins BMP-2, BMP-4 and BMP-7 also have hydrophobic amino acids at the corresponding positions”. This statement should have indicated that “other BMP proteins MP52, BMP-4 and BMP-7 also have hydrophobic amino acids at the corresponding positions”.

Page 11, line 19, of the response states that it “is therefore reasonable to assume that BMP-3, BMP-4, BMP-7 and MP52 all form some kind of hydrophobic pocket” but should have stated that it “is therefore reasonable to assume that BMP-2, BMP-4, BMP-7 and MP52 all form some kind of hydrophobic pocket”.

Page 11, line 22 of the response erroneously lists “TGF- β ” as “TGF-P”.

Page 12, line 10, should read as “thus once” instead of “thus one”.

The above discussed errors are clerical errors which do not change the arguments made in the September 14, 2004 response. This supplemental response is being filed to prevent any misunderstanding with regard to the arguments presented.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Monica Chin Kitts
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,105
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202)783-6040